

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed June 23, 2004 in the above-identified application for Letters Patent. A three (3) month extension of the time period for response has been obtained by a Petition filed on even date herewith, thereby setting the end of the response period on December 23, 2004.

Amendments to the Specification

The specification has been amended at Page 1 to update the status of related applications.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1- 69 , including an inadvertent second occurrence of Claim 13, which should have been designated Claim 14, are pending in the above-noted present application.

Claims 1-13, the second occurrence of Claim 13, 15-49, 53-60 and 63-69 are canceled herein.

Claims 50, 61 and 62 are currently amended herein.

New Claims 70, 71, 72 and 73 are added herein.

Claims 50, 51, 52, 61, 62, and 70-73 remain in the application.

As set forth in Section 1 of the Office Action, Claim 14 (second occurrence of Claim 13) is mis-numbered and requires correction , and in Claim 55 the words “of” and “operation” need to be separated. These Claims have been canceled herein, therefore correction is not required.

In Section 2 of the Office Action, Claims 38-40 and 41-44 stand rejected under 35 USC 112. These Claims have been canceled herein, therefore correction is not required.

Also in Section 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-38, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52-59 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by

Yamaguchi, US Patent Application Publication No. US2003/00389, published on February 27, 2003.

In Section 3 of the Office Action, claims 39 and 40 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi in view of Imbrie, US Patent Application Publication No. US2002/0169002, published on Nov 14, 2002.

In Section 4 of the Office Action, claim 46 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi.

In Section 5 of the Office Action, claims 63-69 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imbrie.

In Section 6 of the Office Action, claims 60-62 stand objected to apparently because they depend from rejected independent Claim 50 and intermediate dependent claim 59 but would be allowable subject to being written in independent form.

Accordingly, Claim 50 (currently amended herein) has been amended to now include therein the limitations set forth in both original claims 59 and 60. Therefore Claim 50 (currently amended) is condition for allowance.

Original claims 51 and 52 depend from and add further limitations to now allowable claim 50, therefore claims 51 and 52 are in condition for allowance.

Objected to claims 61 and 62, originally dependent from claim 60 have been amended herein to now depend from the allowable claim 51 and add further limitations thereto to provide proper antecedent basis for the term "printing server" in claim 61 and the term "transaction service" in claim 62.

Accordingly, claim 50 (currently amended), claim 51 (original), claim 52 (original), claim 61 (currently amended) and claim 62 (currently amended) remain in the application are now in condition for allowance.

As noted above, the remaining original claims 1-49, 53-60 and 63-69 have been canceled herein making the rejections of this group of claims as set forth above in Sections 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Office Action.

With the disclosures of Yamaguchi and Imbrie in mind, Applicant presents herein new Claims 70 – 73. Claims 70 and 71 are directed to a system for printing remote digital images from the Internet using a mobile wireless communication device and a printer, while claims are directed to a corresponding method.

One of the very advantageous embodiments of the present invention provides a system and method that allows a user to browse the web with a wireless communication device operating in an Internet mode, select a image at a web site, issue a Print command to download the image through the wireless device to a connected printer, without having the web browsing experience interrupted. This advantage is noted in at page 17, second paragraph of the specification.

As set forth in new claims 70-73 the system and method employ, in combination, a server on the Internet, a wireless communication device and a printer.

The server on the Internet is accessible via a wireless communications network and is operable to provide web site information, including web based digital images, and image printing information for such images selected by a user for down loading. The web site information and the image printing information have different protocols allowing the web site and image printing information to be transmitted and received together without interfering with each other.

The mobile wireless communication device is operable in user selected modes, including a voice mode for voice communications and an Internet mode for accessing the Internet server to obtain web site and image printing information. The mobile wireless communication device is operable by the user in the Internet mode to access web sites, select an image on a web site and send a PRINT command to the server to initiate downloading of image printing information together with current web site information. The mobile wireless communication device also includes a port which echoes both web site and image printing information.

The printer is for printing a selected image in accordance with its image printing information. The printer includes a controller having a printer port connected to the port of the mobile wireless communication device and the controller is configured to monitor and receive image printing information from the mobile wireless communication device which continues to operate in its Internet mode whereby such continued operation in the Internet mode allows the user to access web sites without interruption during image printing operations by the printer.

The new dependent system claim 71 and the new dependent method claim 73 add the limitations that the server includes means for processing a selected image so that its image printing information is compatible with characteristics of the printer, and the printer includes means for sending printer characteristics to the server through the mobile wireless communication device upon receiving a request for such characteristics information from the server.

Neither Yamaguchi nor Imbrie, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed combination of elements defining Applicant's system set forth in new claims 70 and 71 or his method set forth in new claims 72 and 73.


Yamaguchi, in Fig 3A discloses a system 300 in which the file to be printed is generated within the wireless device and not acquired from the internet as is set forth in the Applicant's new claim. Also shown in Fig 3B is a system 330 in which the electronic document 388 to be printed is stored in the wireless device 332. In [0036] Yamaguchi set forth that when printing, the browser 340 in the wireless device 332 connects with the web server 346 in the interface box 334 which sends interface data back to the web browser to be displayed on 340. Thus, during printing operation the display of the wireless device is used to display printing information and can not be used to display web site information as is the case with the Applicant's system and method.

Imbrie discloses in [0035] a wireless submitting device 20 which may be a lap top, PDA cell phone, digital camera, etc. The focus of his disclosure is on how the submitting device interacts with the printer 70 and the validation device 80. He does not disclose, teach or suggest the Applicant's system and method for having continued web browsing capability while printing.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Yamaguchi nor Imbrie, whether taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed combination of elements defining Applicant's system set forth in new claims 70 and 71 or the combination of steps his method sets forth in new claims 72 and 73. As such, Applicant submits that new claims 70-73 patentably distinguish over these two reference, are in condition for allowance, and request that they be allowed.

For all of the above reasons, Applicant submits that the Specification and Claims are now in proper form, and that the Claims all patentably define over the prior art. Therefore, Applicant submits that this Application is now in condition for allowance, which action he respectfully solicits.

Respectfully submitted)



John S. Vale
Registration No. 25, 937

Polaroid Corporation
Patent Department
1265 Main Street
Waltham, MA 02451
Tel.: 781-386-6405
Fax: 781-386-6435